arXiv:1701.05516v1 [math.CO] 19 Jan 2017

Minimum Cycle Decomposition: A Constructive Characterization for Graphs of Treewidth Two with Node Degrees Two and Four

Irene Heinrich and Sven O. Krumke

January 20, 2017

Abstract

Substantial efforts have been made to compute or estimate the minimum number $c(G)$ of cycles needed to partition the edges of an Eulerian graph. We give an equivalent characterization of Eulerian graphs of treewidth 2 and with maximum degree 4. This characterization enables us to present a linear time algorithm for the computation of $c(G)$ for all G in this class.

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview and Preliminary Results

It is a well-known result that a graph is Eulerian if and only if it is connected and it decomposes into cycles. In this article we focus on finding a minimum cycle decomposition for a graph G, i.e., a decomposition into a minimum number $c(G)$ of cycles.

There has been a lot of research on an upper bound for $c(G)$. Already in 1968, Hajós conjectured that if G is a simple graph, it holds that $c(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, cf. [Lov68]. Dean showed in [Dea86] that the upper bound can be replaced by $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$. Granville and Moisiadis have shown in [AG86] that Hajós conjecture holds true for Eulerian simple graphs of maximum degree four. Seyffarth showed that it is true for every planar simple graph, cf. [Sey92]. Moreover, Fan and Xu showed in [FX02] that Hajós conjecture also holds true for all projective planar graphs and all graphs which do not contain K_6- as a minor. The general conjectue is still open today.

Our goal is to present the class of double ear decomposable graphs on which the exact computation of $c(G)$ is possible in linear time. This class is defined through a constructive characterization: We start with an arbitrary cycle. Then, in every step, we can either subdivide the graph or add a so-called double ear. Every graph that can by constructed in a finite number of such steps is called a *double ear decomposable graph*.

We further show that a graph is double ear decomposable if and only if it is of treewidth at most two and has only node degrees two or four. Thus, we can give a constructive characterization of these graphs. An overview on constructive characterizations in graph theory can be found in [ERK10].

Finally, we present an algorithm that decides in linear time whether a graph is double ear decomposable. In this case, the algorithm also outputs a double ear decomposition. Furthermore, it calculates a minimum cycle decomposition in linear time.

1.2 Notation and Terminology

The graphs discussed in this article may contain multiple edges or loops. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. We set $\mathrm{ord}(G) := |V|$. Let $v \in V$ and $e \in E$. Then $G - e$ denotes the graph obtained by removing the edge e from G and $G - v$ denotes the graph obtained from removing v and all of its adjacent edges from G. A *cut* of G is a partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ of V such that none of the sets V_1 and V_2 is empty. An edge e is *contained* in the cut if it connects a node from V_1 with a node from V_2. The *weight* of a cut is the number of edges it contains. We denote with $\Delta(G)$ the maximum node degree in G. An *even graph* is a graph containing only nodes of even degree. A *decomposition* of a graph is a set of subgraphs such that each edge appears in exactly one subgraph in the set.

Definition 1 (Cycle Decomposition)**.** Let G be an even graph. A decomposition of G into cycles is called a *cycle decomposition*. We call

$$c(G) = \min\{|\mathcal{C}| \mid \mathcal{C} \text{ is a cycle decomposition of } G\}$$

the *cycle number* of G.

2 Cycles in Double Ear Decomposable Graphs

Observation 2. Let G be an even graph. If $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_l$. are the connected components of G, then

$$c(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} c(G_i).$$

Unless stated otherwise, we only consider connected graphs from now on. The even connected graphs are exactly the Eulerian graphs.

Observation 3. Let G be an Eulerian graph. If there is a cut in G of weight two containing the edges e and e', every cycle decomposition of G contains a cycle C with $e, e' \in E(C)$.

Definition 4 (Subdivision, Resolving a Node of Degree 2)**.** A graph G' that is obtained by replacing an edge with endnodes u and w of a graph G by a new path uvw is called a *simple subdivision* of G. We say that G is obtained from G' by *resolving* the node v. Moreover, G'' is called a *subdivision* of G if there

is a finite sequence $(G_0 = G, G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k = G'')$ such that G_i is a simple subdivision of G_{i-1} for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Figure 1: Subdividing the triple edge into a house by simple subdivision steps: The green lines are exchanged by length-two-paths in the next step.



Observation 5. If G' is a subdivision of G, then $c(G) = c(G')$.

Observation 6. Let $e_1, \ldots, e_l$ be the different loops of a graph G. Then

$$c(G) = l + c(G - \{e_1, \ldots, e_l\}).$$

2.1 Double Ear Decompositions

Definition 7 (Adding a Double Ear)**.** Let G be a graph containing a path $P = v_1 \cdots v_r$ such that $\forall i = 1, \ldots, r : \deg_G(v_i) = 2$. We *add a double ear to* P by the following construction:

1. Connect the first and the last vertex of P by a new edge.
2. Duplicate each edge of P.

Also the path v_1 without edges is allowed as a choice of P. In this case, a loop is added to v_1. Observe that all edges added in the above two steps build a cycle. In particular: If G is an Eulerian graph, also the graph obtained by adding a double ear is an Eulerian graph.

Definition 8. Let $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_k)$ be a finite sequence of graphs such that for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$: either

- *double ear step:* G_i is either built by adding a double ear to G_{i-1} or
- *subdivision step:* G_i is a simple subdivision of G_{i-1}.

Then, we call $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_k)$ a double ear decomposition of G_k starting with G_0. If G_0 is a cycle, we call G_k a *double ear decomposable graph.*

2.2 Double Ears Correspond to a Minimum Cycle Decomposition

Theorem 9. *Let $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k'} = G)$ be a double ear decomposition of a graph G with $k \leq k'$ double ear steps. Then*

$$c(G) = c(G_0) + k.$$

Proof. We prove the above statement by induction on k. If $k = 0$, then G is a subdivision of G_0 and thus $c(G) = c(G_0) + 0 = c(G_0) + k$ by Observation 5. Otherwise let $k \geq 1$. Let $1 \leq i \leq k'$ such that G_i is the last double ear step of the decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k'})$. Then, G is a subdivision of G_i and therefore $c(G) = c(G_i)$. By induction $c(G_{i-1}) = c(G_0) + k - 1$ It remains to show that $c(G_i) = c(G_{i-1}) + 1$.

There is a degree-two-path $P = v_0 v_1 \cdots v_r$ in G_{i-1} such that G_i is G_{i-1} plus a double ear added to P.

Case 1 ($v_0 = v_r$)**.** Then, P is a path of length zero in G_{i-1}. This means, G_i is G_{i-1} with one loop added at v_0. We obtain $c(G_i) = c(G_{i-1}) + 1$ by Observation 6.

Case 2 ($v_0 \neq v_r$)**.** There is exactly one edge e_0 in G_{i-1} outside of P which is incident to v_0. Analogously let e_{r+1} be the unique edge in G_{i-1} outside P and incident to v_r. Let G^A and G^B be the two connected components of $G_i - e_0 - e_{r+1}$. We may assume that $P \subseteq G^B$. The problem of finding a minimum cycle decomposition of G_i directly corresponds to solving both of the following two problems: Let $a(e_0)$ and $a(e_{r+1})$ be the endpoints of e_0 and e_{r+1} in G^A. Let $b(e_0)$ and $b(e_{r+1})$ be the endpoints of e_0 and e_{r+1} in G^B.

(A) Decompose G^A into cycles and one path with endnodes $a(e_0)$ and $a(e_{r+1})$ such that the number of cycles in the decomposition is minimized.

(B) Decompose G^B into cycles and one path with endnodes $b(e_0)$ and $b(e_{r+1})$ such that the number of cycles in the decomposition is minimized.

By Observation 3, a minimum cycle decomposition of G_i clearly induces an optimal solution for A and B. Moreover, if $(C_1^A, C_2^A, \ldots, C_{k_A}^A, P^A)$ is an optimal solution for A and $(C_1^B, C_2^B, \ldots, C_{k_B}^B, P^B)$ is an optimal solution for B, where P^B and P^B are the respective paths, then

$$(C_1^A, C_2^A, \ldots, C_{k_A}^A, C_1^B, C_2^B, \ldots, C_{k_B}^B, P^A + P^B + e_0 + e_{r+1})$$

is a minimum cycle decomposition of G_i by Observation 3. We can now solve the two problems separately to obtain a minimum cycle decomposition for G_i:

(A) Any minimum cycle decomposition $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2 \ldots, C_{k-1}\}$ for G_{i-1} induces an optimal solution $\{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{k-2}, P^A\}$ for Problem A.

(B) $\{P, C\}$ is an optimal solution for Problem B, where C is the cycle consisting of all edges in $E(G_i) \setminus E(G_{i-1})$, i. e. C is the double ear added to G_{i-1}. The solution is optimal since G^B is not just a path. So at least one cycle is needed for the desired decomposition.

A minimum cycle decomposition for G_i now is

$$\{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{k-2}, C, P^A + P + e_0 + e_{r+1}\} = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{k-2}, C_{k-1}, C\}.$$

Altogether $c(G) = c(G_i) = c(G_{i-1}) + 1 = k$. □

As an immediate consequence we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 10. *Let G be a double ear decomposable graph with a double ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k'} = G)$ containing $k \leq k'$ double ear steps. Then $c(G) = k + 1$.*

3 A Constructive Characterization of Eulerian Graphs of Treewidth Less or Equal to Two and with Degrees Less or Equal to Four

The main goal of this section is to prove the following constructive characterization.

Theorem 11. *A graph G is double ear decomposable if and only if* $\mathrm{tw}(G) \in \{1, 2\}$ *and its node degrees lie in* $\{2, 4\}$.

Definition 12 (Tree Decomposition, Treewidth, Bags, [Bod98])**.** A *tree decomposition* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a pair $(\{X_i \colon i \in I\}, T = (I, F))$ with $\{X_i \colon i \in I\}$ a family of subsets of V, one for each node of T, and T a tree such that

- $\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i = V$.
- For all edges $vw \in E$, there exists an $i \in I$ with $v \in X_i$ and $w \in X_i$.
- For all $i, j, k \in I$: If j is on the path from i to k in T, then $X_i \cap X_k \subseteq X_j$.

For $i \in I$, X_i is called a *bag* of the tree decomposition. The *width* of a tree decomposition $(\{X_i \colon i \in I\}, T = (I, F))$ is $\max_{i \in I} |X_i| - 1$. The *treewidth* of a graph G is the minimum width over all possible tree decompositions of G.

Lemma 13 ([Bod98])**.** *Suppose the treewidth of G is k. G has a tree decomposition $(\{X_i, i \in I\}, T = (I, F))$ of width k such that*

- *For all $i \in I \colon |X_i| = k + 1$.*
- *For all $(i, j) \in F \colon |X_i \cap X_j| = k$.*

Definition 14. A tree decomposition as in Lemma 13 is called a *smooth* tree decomposition.

Lemma 15. *Let $(\{X_i, i \in I\}, T = (I, F))$ be a smooth tree decomposition of a graph G. Let i be a leave of T. Then, there exists a vertex $v \in X_i$ whose neighbourhood is a subset of X_i.*

Proof. If i is the only node of T, then there is nothing to show. Otherwise, let j be the unique neighbour of i in T. By assumption $|X_i \cap X_j| = k$. Thus, there is exactly one node v in X_i which does not lie in X_j. This node must not appear in any other node of T since every path between i and another node of T traverses j. Thus, all neighbours of v are contained in X_i. □

Lemma 16. *Let G' be a subdivision of a graph G. Then*

$$\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq 2 \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{tw}(G') \leq 2.$$

Proof. The graph G is a minor of G'. Thus, $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq \mathrm{tw}(G')$.

Let now G be a graph with $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq 2$. We show that subdividing one edge does not increase the treewidth to more than 2. The statement above then follows inductively. Let xz be the edge of G which is replaced by the edges xy and yz in the subdivision. Let (X, T) be a minimum tree decomposition of G with $X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_l\}$. Then, there must be a bag $X_i \in X$ containing x and z. We add a new bag $X_{l+1} = \{x, y, z\}$ to T and a new edge $X_{l+1}X_i$ to T. The result is a tree decomposition of G' of width 2. □

Observation 17. Adding parallel edges does not change the treewidth. The same tree decomposition can be maintained.

We are now able to show that all double ear decomposable graphs are of treewidth less than or equal to two and that they have all node degrees in $\{2, 4\}$.

Proof of Theorem 11, Part I. Let G be a double ear decomposable graph with a decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_k)$. It follows immediately by induction on k that $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq 2$ (cf. Figure 2) and for all $v \in V(G)$: $\deg_G(v) \in \{2, 4\}$. □

Figure 2: Adding a double-ear does not change the treewidth.



(I) The treewidth of this graph is less than or equal to two (by induction).



(II) By Lemma 16 the treewidth of this graph is less than or equal to two.



(III) Adding a parallel edge does not change the treewidth.



(IV) Subdividing the edge *be* does not change the treewidth by Lemma 16



(V) Again, adding parallel edges does not change the treewidth.

Lemma 18. *Let $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k-1}, G)$ be a double ear decomposition of G starting with a cycle. Assume that there are exactly two parallel edges e_1 and e_2 connecting the nodes v and w in G. Then, exactly one of the following statements holds true:*

a) $G_0 = G$ *consists of the nodes* v, w *and the two parallel edges* e_1 *and* e_2.

b) There is an index $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ *such that in* G_i *there is a loop wich is subdivided into the two edges* e_1 *and* e_2 *in* G_{i+1}.

c) One of the parallel edges arises from a double ear step: There is an $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ *such that one of the two edges (W.l.o.g.* e_1*) is part of* G_i *whereas* e_2 *appears firstly in* G_{i+1}. *Furthermore,* G_{i+1} *is* G_i *plus a double ear added to some path* P *and*

- *either* G_i *is a cycle,* $e_1 \notin P$ *and* v, w *are the two ends of* P
- *or* $e_1 \in P$ *and at least one of the nodes* v, w *lies in the interior of* P.

Proof. We may assume that the index where e_1 appears first in a graph $G_i, i = 0, \ldots, k$ is less than or equal to the index i^* where e_2 appears first. This enhances us to distinguish the following three cases. Let

Case 1 ($i^* = 0$)**.** This means that e_1 and e_2 are already contained in G_0. Since G_0 is a cycle, we get that the two parallel edges e_1 and e_2 form the whole cycle G_0.

Case 2 ($i^* > 0$ and $G_{i^*-1} \to G_{i^*}$ is a simple subdivision)**.** The only possibility for a parallel edge to arise from a simple subdivision is the subdivision of a loop.

Case 3 ($i^* > 0$ and $G_{i^*-1} \to G_{i^*}$ is a double ear step)**.** Let P be the degree two path in G_{i^*-1} to which the double ear is added. If P contains e_1, then at least one end of e_1 is in the interior of P. Otherwise, the double ear step would result in a triple edge which contradicts the assumption. If P does not contain e_1, its both ends must be v and w. Consequently G_{i^*-1} is a cycle since all nodes in P are of degree two.

□

Lemma 19. *Let* $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k-1}, G)$ *be a double ear decomposition starting with a cycle. Assume that there are exactly three parallel edges* e_1, e_2 *and* e_3 *connecting two nodes* v *and* w *in* G. *Then, there is an index* $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ *such that* $\deg_{G_i}(u) = \deg_{G_i}(v) = 2$, *there is an edge* e *in* G_i *connecting* v *with* w *and* G_{i+1} *is constructed by adding a double ear to the path* vw *in* G_i.

Proof. A triple edge can not be generated by a simple subdivision and neither can G_0 be a triple edge. Thus, there must be an index i^* such that $G_{i^*-1} \to G_{i^*}$ is a double ear step and G_{i^*} is the first graph in the decomposition that contains all three parallel edges e_1, e_2, e_3. Consequently, exactly one of the three edges, say e_1, already is contained in the edge set of G_{i^*-1} and G_{i^*} is constructed by adding a double ear to the path vw. □

Lemma 20. *Let* $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k-1}, G)$ *be an ear decomposition starting with a cycle. Let* e_1, e_2, e_3 *and* e_4 *be four parallel edges in* G *connecting two different nodes* $v, w \in V(G)$. *Then,* G *is a quadruple edge.*

Proof. From theorem 11, we know that the maximum degree of a node in G is four. Thus, G is a quadruple edge. □

Proof of Theorem 11, Part II. Let G be a graph with $\deg(v) \in \{2, 4\}$ for all $v \in V(G)$ and $\mathrm{tw}(G) \in \{1, 2\}$. We prove that G is a double ear decomposable graph by induction on the number n of vertices in G.

In the case of $n = 1$, G is either a single or a double loop. Both are double ear decomposable. If G is a single loop, $\{G\}$ is a double ear decomposition since G is a cycle itself. Otherwise $\{G_0, G\}$ is a double ear decomposition, where G_0 is a single loop. The double ear step is done by considering the length-zero-path consisting of the only node in G_0.

Let now $n \geq 2$. By Lemma 13 there is a smooth tree decomposition $(\{X_i, i \in I\}, T = (I, F))$ of G of width 2. From Lemma 15, we obtain a node $u \in V$ that appears in exactly one bag X_i and all of the neighbours of u are contained in X_i. Thus, u has either exactly one neighbour v or it has two neighbours v and w.

The main concept behind this induction is to consider a graph G' (mostly) with node set $V - u$ and $\mathrm{tw}(G') \leq 2$ and node degrees 2 and 4. By induction, G' has a double ear decomposition. The idea then is to manipulate this decomposition of G' such that we obtain a decomposition of G.

Case 1 (u has one neighbour v and $\deg(u) = 2$)**.** If $\deg(v) = 2$ then G is a cycle and thus (G) is a double ear decomposition of G. Otherwise, we consider $G' = G - u$. Then $\mathrm{tw}(G') \leq 2$ and all of the degrees in G' are still two or four. Thus, we can apply the induction hypothesis to obtain that G' is double ear decomposable. Observe that $\deg_{G'}(v) = 2$. We choose the path v of length zero for a next double ear step and obtain a graph G'' which is G' with a loop added to v. We subdivide this loop to obtain G.

Case 2 (u has one neighbour v, $\deg(u) = 4$ and there is no loop at u)**.** The graph G is a quadruple edge by Lemma 20. We find the double ear decomposition of G as follows: Start with a cycle of length two and then add a double ear by considering a path of length one.

Figure 3: First three cases.



Case 3 (u has two neighbours v, w and $\deg_G(u) = 2$)**.** Construct a graph G' by removing u and adding an edge between v and w. All degrees in G' are preserved from G and $\mathrm{tw}(G') \leq 2$. By induction we obtain that G' has a double ear decomposition. We construct G by subdividing an edge between v and w in G'. Thus, also G has a double ear decomposition.

Case 4 (u shares one edge with v and three edges with w)**.** Construct G' by removing u and adding one edge between v and w. Observe that $\deg_{G'}(w) = 2$. By induction G' is a double ear decomposable graph with decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G')$. We construct a graph G'' by subdividing the edge between v and w with u. Now, G is obtained from G'' by adding a double ear to the path vu. Thus, $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G'', G)$ is a double ear decomposition of G.



Case 5 (u shares two edges with v and two edges with w, the nodes v and w are adjacent)**.** Thus, $\deg_G(v) = \deg_G(w) = 4$. Assume that u, v and w are the only nodes of G. Then, each pair of nodes is connected by two exactly two edges in G. Set $G_0 = (\{u, v, w\}, \{uv, vw, wu\})$. Then (G_0, G) is a double ear decomposition of G.

Otherwise, there exists at least one other node in G. Let x be the additional neighbour of v and y be the additional neighbour of w. Note that x and y might be the same node. Construct G' by removing u, v and w from G and adding one edge between x and y. By induction G' has a double ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G')$. Construct a graph G'' via subdivision of the edge between x and y by inserting v, u, w. Insert an ear at the path wuv. The resulting graph is G. Altogether G has a double ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G', G'', G)$.



Case 6 (u shares two edges with v and two edges with w, the nodes v and w are not adjacent, $\deg_G(w) = \deg_G(v) = 4$)**.** Construct G' by removing u and adding two edges, say e_1 and e_2, between v and w. By induction, G' has a double ear decomposition $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_k = G')$. In G', there are exaclty two edges connecting v and w. Hence, we can apply Lemma 18 and obtain three possible cases:

a) G' is isomorphic to a double edge: This case can not occur since v and w are of degree 4.

b) There is an index $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ such that in G_i there is a loop e which is subdivided into the two edges e_1 and e_2 to construct G_{i+1}: W.l.o.g. let v be the node that subdivides the loop. Construct G'_i by subdividing e with the node u. Now, consider the length-zero-path u in G'_i and add a double ear

(i.e. a loop e') to it. The resulting graph is called G_i''. Construct a third graph G'_{i+1} by subdividing e' with v.

We obtain a double ear decomposition

$$(G_1, \ldots, G_i, G'_i, G''_i, G'_{i+1}, G'_{i+2}, G'_{i+1}, \ldots, G'_k = G)$$

of G, where for all $j \geq 1$: G'_{j+1} arises from G'_j by applying the same construction step that is used to construct G_{j+1} from G_j.



c) One of the parallel edges arises from a double ear step: There is an $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ such that one of the two edges (W.l.o.g. e_1) is also an edge of G_i whereas e_2 appears firstly in G_{i+1}. Furthermore, G_{i+1} is G_i plus a double ear added to some path P and

- either G_i is a cycle, say a C_n, $e_1 \notin P$ and v, w are the two ends of P: In this case, we construct G'_i by subdividing the edge vw with u. Further, construct G'_{i+1} by adding a double ear to the unique path between u and v that does not contain the edge between u and v. Then, $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_i, G'_i, G'_{i+1}, \ldots, G'_k = G)$ is a double ear decomposition of G where for all $j \geq 1$: G'_{j+1} arises from G'_j by applying the same construction step that is used to construct G_{j+1} from G_j.
- or $e_1 \in P$ and at least one of the nodes v, w lies in the interior of P: We construct G'_i by a simple subdivison of the edge e_1 in G_i. Let P' be the path which is P with the subdivided edge e_1. We construct G'_{i+1} by adding a double ear to P'. From now on, we can use the same construction steps as in the double ear decomposition of G' to obtain G.



Case 7 (There is a loop at u and $\deg_G(u) = 4$)**.**

a) Assume that u has two different neighbours v and w. Construct G' by removing u and adding an edge between v and w. By induction G' is double ear decomposable. Next, we use a simple subdivison of and edge between v and w to obtain a graph G''. We call the subdividing node u. If we now add a double ear to the path u in G'', we obtain G.

b) If u has only one neighbour v in G, the construction is analogous: Construct G' by removing u and adding a loop to v. Then subdivide the loop by a node u and add a double ear to the path u. □



4 Calculating Double Ear Decompositions

Let G be a graph. Theorem 11 allows to decide in linear time, whether G is double ear decomposable or not: We check if all of the node degrees are two or four. Moreover, G is of treewidth two if and only if all of its biconnected components are series parallel graphs. Calculating the biconnected components of G is also possible in linear time as well as checking if the components are series parallel.

We will present another algorithm that tests if a graph G is double ear decomposable (i.e. $\text{tw}(G) \leq 2$ and all degrees are in $\{2, 4\}$). If this is the case, the algorithm outputs the minimum cycle number in linear time.

4.1 Reduction Steps

The idea of the algorithm is to apply the reduction steps below.

4.1.1 Reduction I: Loops

If e is a loop in G, and e is not the only edge in G set $G := G - e$ and $c := c + 1$. In the decomposition a loop is added to the path in $G - e$ consisting only of the endnode of e. If e is a loop and it is the only edge of G, the decomposition starts with the loop e. Return $c + 1$ and the calculated decomposition.

4.1.2 Reduction II: Double Edges

Assume G contains two nodes v and w with $\deg(v) = \deg(w) = 4$ which are connected by exactly two edges e'_1 and e'_2. Calculate an inclusion-wise maximal path $P = (v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_l, v_l)$ which fulfils

- $e'_1 \in \{e_1, \ldots, e_l\}$,
- for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$: v_i has exactly two different neighbours.

Remove P from G and remove an edge connecting v_0 and v_l from G. Set $c := c + 1$.

4.1.3 Reduction III: Triple Edges

Assume G contains two nodes v and w with $\deg(v) = \deg(w) = 4$ which are connected by exactly three edges e_1, e_2, e_3. Set $G := G - e_2 - e_3$ and $c := c + 1$.

4.1.4 Reduction IV: Quadruple Edges

If there is a quadruple edge, then G is a quadruple edge by Lemma 20. In this case the cycle decomposition of G consists of two cycles of length two. Set $c := c + 2$. The cycle decomposition of the quadruple edge starts with a cycle of length two. Then, a double ear is added to a path of length one to obtain the quadruple edge. Return c and the double ear decomposition.

4.1.5 Reduction V: Resolving

If u is a node of degree two in G and G contains more that one node, we choose G' to be the graph where u is resolved. The value c remains unchanged by Observation 5.

4.1.6 Failure

If none of the above reduction steps is applicable, return "This is not a double ear decomposable graph!"

4.2 The Algorithm and its Analysis

The algorithm has a simple structure: As long as one of the above reduction steps is possible, it applies this step. To implement the algorithm, we first compute the degrees of all nodes and build two lists V_2 and V_4 of the nodes of degree 2 and 4, respectively. We also replace each bundle B of parallel edges by a single edge with weight equal to the cardinality of B and build lists E_2, E_3 and E_4 of the edges with weights 2, 3 and 4, respectively. We also build a list L of loops in the graph. Each vertex and each edge is linked to its (potential) entries in the lists via a pointer. We also add a marker `visited` to each vertex $v \in V$ which initially is set to false. The initial structures can be built in time linear in the size of the graph.

In each iteration we first test whether a Reduction I which removes loops can be done. This test can be done easily by inspecting the list L of loops in the graph. If no loops exist, we then test whether a Reduction V (resolving) is possible. This can be done in constant time by checking the list V_2. If V_2 is nonempty, say $v \in V_2$, and v has two neighbors u and w, we check whether w

is already in the adjacency list of u. If this is not the case, we add w to the adjacency list of u and vice versa. Otherwise we simply increase the weight of the edge uv by 1. Finally, we remove v from the graph. If necessary, we update the edge lists using the pointers attached to the edges. Clearly, all of these steps can be carried out in constant time.

If no reductions of Type I and V are possible, we check whether a Reduction IV is applicable. This is straightforward by inspecting E_4. Notice that by Lemma 20, this reduction is the final reduction on a graph of constant size, so this final iteration needs constant time.

Observe that, given the situation that there are no quadruple edges, a Reduction III is applicable if and only if the list E_3 is nonempty. Thus, we can handle this reduction by checking E_3 and decreasing the weights of the involved edges as well as updating the vertex and edge lists in constant time.

The final case that needs to be handled is the situation that the only potential reduction is one of Type II. We can now pick an arbitrary vertex u from the list V_4 and one of its neighbors v of degree 4. We mark both vertices u and v as visited by setting their marker `visited` to true and initialize the path to contain the edge uv. We now start a search at u by setting u to be the active vertex. If the current active vertex x has exactly two neighbors inductively, exactly one of those neighbors will be unvisited. Let y be this neighbor, which then is connected to x by a double edge. We add the edge xy to the path, mark y to be visited and make y the active vertex. We carry out the analogous search from v. Since all degrees of the nodes in the graph are 2 or 4, this yields an inclusionwise maximal path P with the properties needed for Reduction II. Removing the path P from the graph, updating the degrees and lists and resetting all the touched markers as unvisited needs time proportional to the length of P. Thus, the overall running time of the algorithm is linear.

4.2.1 Correctness

We know by Theorem 9 that if G is G' plus some double ear, then $c(G) = c(G')+1$. Thus, we only need to prove the following statement. The correctness then follows by induction.

Lemma 21. *If G is a double ear decomposable graph, then one of the above reduction steps is always possible and the reduced graph G' is also double ear decomposable.*

Proof. Let $(G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_k = G)$ be a double ear decomposition of G. If the step from G_{k-1} to G is a subdivision, there is a node of degree 2 in G and we can apply the resolving-reduction (unless G itself is a loop – then we apply the loop reduction and the algorithm returns $c = 1$ and the double ear decomposition (G)). Otherwise G is built by adding a double ear to a degree-2-path P in G_{k-1}. If P is of length 0, we can apply the loop-reduction. If P is of length 1, we can apply the triple- or the quadruple-edge-reduction. Otherwise, we can apply the double-edge-reduction.

It remains to show that G' is also a double ear decomposable graph. But this actually follows immediately with Theorem 11. The treewidth is not increased by the reduction steps and also the degree condition stays true. □

References

[AG86] Alexandros Moisiadis Andrew Granville. "On Hajós' Conjecture (Minimum Cycle-Partition of the Edge-Set of Eulerian Graphs)". In: *Proceedings of the Manitoba Conference on Numerical Mathematics and Computing* (1986).

[Bod98] Hans Leo Bodlaender. "A partial k-arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth". In: *Theoretical Computer Science* (1998).

[Dea86] Nathaniel Dean. "What is the Smallest Number of Dicycles in a Dicycle Decomposition of an Eulerian Digraph?" In: *Journal of Graph Theory* (1986).

[ERK10] László A. Végh Erika R. Kovács. "Constructive Characterization Theorems in Combinatorial Optimization". In: *Combinatorica* (2010).

[FX02] G. Fan and B. Xu. "Hajós' conjecture and projective graphs." In: *Discrete Mathematics* (2002).

[Lov68] L. Lovász. "On covering of graphs". In: *Theory of Graphs* (1968).

[Sey92] Karen Seyffarth. "Hajos' conjecture and small cycle double covers of planar graphs". In: *Discrete mathematics* (1992).